

violation of the Anti-Deficiency Act in no way releases an officer or employees from the requirements set forth pursuant to the Act.

Inserts language making several technical corrections to economic development initiatives under the heading "Community Development Fund" in Public Law 107-73.

CHAPTER 14  
GENERAL PROVISIONS

The conference agreement includes section 1401, as proposed by the Senate, which states that amounts obligated pursuant to this division are subject to the terms and conditions provided in Public Law 107-38. The House had no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes section 1402, as proposed by the House and the Senate, concerning availability of funds appropriated within this division.

The conference agreement includes section 1403 concerning transfer authority for national guard expenses for services related to homeland security. Each request for transfer shall include a declaration that, as of the date of the request, none of the funds proposed for transfer have been obligated, and none will be obligated, until the Committees on Appropriations have approved the request.

DIVISION C—SPENDING LIMITS AND BUDGETARY ALLOCATIONS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2002

The conference agreement includes, as division C, budgetary provisions that are necessary to conform existing budget law with final appropriations agreements. Sections 101 adjusts the fiscal year 2002 discretionary caps in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 to levels consistent with final appropriations action. This section also provides for conforming adjustments to the fiscal year 2002 budget resolution, and includes a small budget authority allowance for technical scoring differences that may exist between the Office of Management and Budget and the Congressional Budget Office. Section 102 resets the Pay-As-You-Go scorecard to zero.

DIVISION D—MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

The conference agreement modifies a provision, proposed by the Senate in Division E, related to certain real property in South Dakota. The House bill contained no similar provision.

The conference agreement includes the text of a provision, proposed by the Senate in Division E, Title II, section 201, which expands the number of Trustees of the John F. Kennedy Center for the Performing Arts. The House had no similar provision.

DIVISION A

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2002 recommended by the Committee of Conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2001 amount, the 2002 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2002 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001 .....	298,515,154
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002 .....	319,547,116
House bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	317,624,089
Senate bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	317,623,483
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2002 .....	317,623,747

Conference agreement compared with:	
New budget (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2001 .....	+19,108,593
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002 .....	-1,923,369
House bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	-342
Senate bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	+264

DIVISION B

The total new budget (obligational) authority for the fiscal year 2002 recommended by the committee of conference, with comparisons to the fiscal year 2002 budget estimates, and the House and Senate bills for 2002 follow:

[In thousands of dollars]

Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002 .....	20,000,000
House bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	20,000,000
Senate bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	20,000,000
Conference agreement, fiscal year 2002 .....	20,000,000
Conference agreement compared with:	
Budget estimates of new (obligational) authority, fiscal year 2002 .....	
House bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	
Senate bill, fiscal year 2002 .....	

For consideration of Division A of the House bill and Division A of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

- JERRY LEWIS,
  - BILL YOUNG,
  - JOE SKEEN,
  - DAVE HOBSON,
  - HENRY BONILLA,
  - GEORGE R. NETHERCUTT, Jr.,
  - RANDY "DUKE" CUNNINGHAM,
  - RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN,
  - TODD TIAHRT,
  - JOHN P. MURTHA,
  - NORMAN D. DICKS,
  - MARTIN OLAV SABO,
  - PETER J. VISCLOSKY,
  - JAMES P. MORAN,
  - DAVID R. OBEY
- (except for aircraft leasing).

For consideration of all other matters of the House bill and other matters of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference:

- BILL YOUNG,
  - JERRY LEWIS,
  - DAVID OBEY,
- Managers on the Part of the House.*
- DANIEL K. INOUE,
  - ERNEST F. HOLLINGS,
  - ROBERT C. BYRD,
  - PATRICK J. LEAHY,
  - TOM HARKIN,
  - BYRON L. DORGAN,
  - RICHARD J. DURBIN,
  - HARRY REID,
  - DIANNE FEINSTEIN,
  - HERB KOHL,
  - TED STEVENS,
  - THAD COCHRAN,
  - ARLEN SPECTER,
  - PETE DOMENICI,

- CHRISTOPHER BOND,
  - MITCH MCCONNELL,
  - RICHARD C. SHELBY,
  - JUDD GREGG,
  - KAY BAILEY HUTCHISON,
- Managers on the Part of the Senate.*

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3525, ECONOMIC SECURITY AND WORKER ASSISTANCE ACT OF 2001

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, by the direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 320 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 320

*Resolved*, That upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order without intervention of any point of order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3529) to provide tax incentives for economic recovery and assistance to displaced workers. The bill shall be considered as read for amendment. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) two hours of debate on the bill equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit. The yeas and nays shall be considered as ordered on the question of passage. Clause 5(b) of rule XXI shall not apply to the bill or amendments thereto.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST), the ranking member of the Committee on Rules, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

Mr. Speaker, House Resolution 320 is a closed rule providing for consideration of H.R. 3529, the Economic Security and Worker Assistance Act of 2001, with 2 hours of debate in the House, equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means. The rule waives all points of order against consideration of the bill, and it provides for one motion to recommit, with or without instructions.

Mr. Speaker, while the images of September 11's terrorist attacks will last forever in the minds of the American people, the fact is that the full impact of that day goes beyond that which we could conceive in the piles of rubble and twisted metal. While economic indicators show this Nation's economic downturn began in September of 2000, a full year before the attacks of September 11, that vicious assault on our Nation and its people only exacerbated an already fragile situation.

Months before the latest crisis, this Congress showed the leadership, the bipartisanship, and sense of purpose

needed to bring our economy back through tax reduction for working Americans. We knew then that tax cuts put more money in the pockets of working families, increased consumer savings and spending, and spurred our economy back to recovery.

We came together, too, immediately after September 11, in another strong showing of leadership, bipartisanship, and sense of purpose when we gave this President the tools he needed to fight terrorism and punish those responsible for the attacks on our country, and began our financial commitment to rebuild those areas devastated by terrorism.

Today, we need to come together yet again, this time for America's workers; and the leadership, bipartisanship and sense of purpose we have shown the people of this great country must be evident again.

Cutbacks, layoffs, plummeting consumer confidence. These are some of the key factors contributing to our current economic situation. Just as we fortified our Nation's military in response to the attacks on our shores, we have the opportunity to fortify this Nation's economy against the attack on it by keeping jobs, by creating jobs, and by giving needed help to displaced workers.

Mr. Speaker, as my colleagues might be aware, we have an hour on this rule and a 2-hour debate on the economic stimulus bill yet before us tonight.

Make no mistake. This economic stimulus is critical to the workers and working families of America.

President Bush warned us this past weekend that without an economic stimulus package, we stand to lose as many as 300,000 American jobs; and no one knows of the current job struggle like my constituents and fellow New Yorkers across my great State. In New York City alone, some 79,000 workers lost their jobs in the month of October. The ripple effect, where an estimated 15 percent of all State revenues are generated in Lower Manhattan, is, indeed, being felt across our State and our Nation. In fact, between September and October, 62,000 workers across New York became unemployed.

According to the New York State Labor Department, the Buffalo-Niagara region where I hail from lost 2,900 jobs over the last year. This is the longest decline in the local job market in 8 years.

The fact is that jobs just do not create themselves, and we in this Congress have both the ability and the responsibility to help create those jobs. This bill recognizes that we cannot create employees if we do not work with employers to create jobs.

As Franklin Delano Roosevelt once said, "I believe, I have always believed, and I will always believe in private enterprise as the backbone of economic well-being in America."

□ 2315

Through new incentives to compete, grow, and expand, the bipartisan, bicameral Economic Security and Worker Protection Act of 2001 will help business rebuild and create jobs for the American people. Workers want and they deserve a paycheck, not an unemployment check.

Of course, this stimulus package recognizes that job creation is a long-term project, and that assisting those out of work requires immediate short-term solutions. For those who have lost their jobs, an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits will be provided, retroactive to March, 2001.

Part-time workers will be aided by \$9 billion in surplus Federal unemployment funds transferred to States in order to help with health care or employment services.

Equally important to our work force is the availability and affordability of adequate health care. With the refundable health care tax credit provided in this legislation, no worker eligible for unemployment insurance will be left without the means to obtain quality health care protection.

So when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the other Chamber wanted only COBRA-eligible workers to get a tax credit, leaving 45 percent of laid-off workers in small- and medium-sized businesses and those who never had job-based health care, let us not forget, not for a minute, who some of those workers are.

What about those who owned or worked in the delis or dry cleaners, those who delivered goods and cleaned offices in lower Manhattan? Should they have been excluded from being able to have affordable health care, as many would under the plan advanced by the Democratic leadership in the other body?

The bipartisan compromise plan, on the other hand, provides a refundable 60 percent tax credit for health insurance premiums paid by displaced workers. Those workers who had prior health insurance coverage will have the right to guaranteed coverage. Additionally, the bill provides for an extension of the Archer Medical Savings Accounts, allowing families and individuals to be in charge of their own health care dollars.

Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to wind down the first session of this 107th Congress, we can look back on a record of great accomplishment for the American people. We cut taxes for working families, we enacted sweeping education reforms that provide the blueprint and resources to ensure that no child is left behind, and we came together to lead a global war on terrorism, a war that we and freedom-loving people everywhere are winning.

Our action tonight sends a strong message that this House is working to retain jobs, to create jobs, and to pro-

tect displaced workers in their time of need.

Mr. Speaker, let us finish this year as it began, in a strong bipartisan effort that will protect American workers and create American jobs. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to make several basic points to my colleagues in the discussion on this rule.

First is the question of bipartisanship. The Democrats in good faith entered into negotiations with Republicans to try and work out a stimulus package. Republicans broke off those negotiations and commenced an attack on the majority leader in the Senate. That was their response to bipartisanship.

Instead of permitting Democrats to bring a substitute up tonight, which perhaps might attract some bipartisan votes and be a real bipartisan solution, they crafted a closed rule. That was their response to bipartisanship.

Mr. Speaker, one of the previous speakers earlier this evening mentioned the visit by the President of the United States to the Democratic Caucus today. The President came to the Caucus and thanked us for our support in the war on terrorism. The President did not mention the economic stimulus package, and we were advised in advance of his visit that he would not take any questions about the economic stimulus package.

Now, we all have a great deal of respect for the office of the Presidency, but this was not an act of bipartisanship this morning.

Mr. Speaker, this bill will cost a whopping \$250 billion over the next 5 years. This bill has no offsets for these costs, so the entire amount will be added to the deficits the director of OMB has predicted for fiscal years 2002, 2003, and 2004. That means, plain and simple, we are in the Social Security trust fund, we will not be paying down the debt, and our fiscal picture grows bleak once again.

The substitute that we sought to offer and that we were denied by this rule would have paid for the cost of the Democratic package and would not have contributed to further deficits in this country.

Mr. Speaker, one of the key differences between the Democratic alternative, which we will not be permitted to vote on, and the package before us deals with health care.

Let me be very clear, Mr. Speaker: The core of the Republican health care provision in this bill is a hollow promise and a cruel hoax. On page 100 of the bill, page 100 of the bill, there is a short section, section 757(a), that instructs the administration to establish some

sort of program sometime in the future, which is supposed to provide the unemployed with vouchers for health care.

Republicans set no deadline for developing this new program, and they provide no specifications for how it might work. It is little more than a vague promise. Democrats would take an existing program, the COBRA program, and use that to immediately provide health care for unemployed workers.

I know Members sometimes do not have the opportunity to read legislation that is produced hastily and presented to the floor hastily, as the Republicans are presenting this bill, so I would like to read the section that I just mentioned, this Republican alternative to the existing program of COBRA:

“Advanced payments of displaced worker health insurance credit. General rule. The Secretary shall establish a program for making payments on behalf of eligible individuals to providers of health insurance for such individuals. ‘Eligible individual.’ For purpose of this section, the term ‘eligible individual’ means any individual for whom a qualified health insurance credit eligibility certificate is in effect. Qualified health insurance credit eligibility certificate. For purposes of this section, a qualified health insurance credit eligibility certificate is a statement certified by a State agency or by any other entity designated by the Secretary which certifies that the individual was unemployed within the meaning of section 6429 as of the first day of the month, and provides such other information as the Secretary may require for purposes of this section.”

When asked when this section would be implemented by the Secretary of the Treasury, the chairman of the Committee, the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS) told the Committee on Rules “sometime this spring,” he hopes.

Mr. Speaker, until this promise is somehow fulfilled, laid-off workers are practically on their own if they want health insurance. That is because, Mr. Speaker, Republicans offer nothing more than a refundable tax credit for every American who is unemployed today, and for every American who loses his job when this Rube Goldberg scheme that I just read has been designed, developed, and put in place.

In other words, if you lose your job, the Republican bill requires you to scrape together several thousand dollars to pay for health insurance bills right now, at the same time you are scrambling to pay for rent and buy groceries, and according to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMAS), to file for a government voucher to offset part of the cost, which may be granted sometime in the future when the program is designed.

Mr. Speaker, we offer a very simple program: We take the existing COBRA program that was passed many years ago by this Congress, and it provides health insurance for unemployed workers, and extend that to workers who have been laid off recently, and provide 75 percent of that to be paid for by the government now, not at some future date when this program may be set up by the Secretary.

Mr. Speaker, Americans who lose their jobs do not need refundable tax credits, vouchers in the future; they need direct assistance right now to pay their health insurance premiums, and they need guaranteed access to affordable health insurance policies.

Mr. Speaker, this bill ignores the fact Democrats in the House and Senate, including the Senate majority leader, have made good-faith efforts and major concessions in an attempt to reach accommodation on an economic stimulus package that is good for the country and good for American workers.

Mr. Speaker, this bill, this rule, denies the minority the opportunity to offer its own substitute, and I can tell the Members why the majority denies the minority that opportunity: They are afraid we might pass it, and they are afraid then the Senate might actually take something up which is truly bipartisan and could be passed before we go home.

What they have done is to design a scheme to present a bill that they know the Senate will not consider. This is a cynical approach on the part of the majority. First they break off bipartisan talks, and then they try and blame us for the fact that they present a partisan bill without an alternative that they know will not be considered by the other body.

The American public deserves better, Mr. Speaker. Defeat this rule, go back to the Committee on Rules, which we could very easily do, we are going to be here all night anyway, and report out a rule that gives the Democrats the option of offering an alternative on the floor which could attract, I believe, Republican votes which could be passed tonight and which the Senate could take up tomorrow, rather than passing a bill that is going nowhere.

The majority knows this, and the majority is treating the American public with the back of their hand.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the first thing when we listen to my colleague is, let us make no mistake about it, the Committee on Rules has allowed as the tradition of the Republican majority long before I got here, beginning in its majority in 1995, they made a vow then, a commitment then, that it carries out each and every time: A motion to recommit by the minority, something that in the 40

years that the Republicans were in the minority, they did not have that opportunity to see.

When we talk about the debate, which I hope, in the 2-hour debate that the Committee on Rules afforded the Committee on Ways and Means chairman and the ranking minority member to air out these important details, that we will not lose sight, as the ranking member has talked about some of the deficiencies he saw, that first and foremost, the Democratic plan involves a tax increase. That is how they want to pay for it, a tax increase.

□ 2330

Second, when my colleague talks about the plan that is before us, when my State has 15 percent of its revenues that were generated in the area, in the 15 blocks around the World Trade Center, how can anyone say repairing our economy in the wake of September 11 is not part of the war on terrorism?

Finally, when the ranking member talked about some of the health care, the view of the Democratic plan is if you are COBRA eligible, we are going to take care of you. Except they have lost sight of the 45 percent of the other American workers across this country, across my State, across the City of New York that do not have COBRA eligibility and do not have COBRA option.

The Thomas bill addresses the opportunities of those 45 percent of the displaced workers that need the type of help that this legislation has.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. GANSKE).

Mr. GANSKE. Mr. Speaker, the economy is sick. Unemployment is going up. The economy does need a shot in the arm. This bill contains provisions to help the unemployed with health care coverage, provisions to encourage business investment and deductions for capital losses. I rise in support of the rule and in support of the underlying bill.

This bill will cut the current 27 percent rate to 25 percent. It will provide tax incentives to businesses for investments and give low income workers a one-time \$300 per person tax rebate. It provides \$33 billion in assistance to unemployed workers next year up from \$13 billion in the original House bill. It does not include the full repeal of the corporate AMT.

The toughest issue to reach compromise on, as you can already see from the debate, is how to provide health insurance coverage to people who lost their jobs. This bill gives laid-off workers a tax credit they can use to buy health care coverage from insurers. This is a more comprehensive approach than simply providing subsidies through existing health plans. I think this bill will help a larger universe of unemployed workers, particularly workers for small businesses.

This stimulus bill will also help with rebuilding New York. It will help the September 11 victims' families. Furthermore, it provides up to 13 weeks of extended benefits for those who became unemployed after March 2001.

I call on my colleagues to support this bill and I hope that the Senate takes this up before they go home for Christmas.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO).

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Coming from the State with the highest unemployment rate in the United States, I speak with a sense of urgency and all too much familiarity with the need to stimulate the economy and employment. But the corporations that have laid off thousands of Oregonians and millions of others across the United States, they do not lack cash in their coffers. Some have record amounts of cash on hand, according to the Wall Street Journal. There is no demand for their product.

Now, the Republicans would shovel more cash into their treasuries that are already overflowing. Every problem should be solved by a tax cut on their side of the aisle. Surplus? Tax cuts. Terrorist attacks? Tax cuts. Deficits? Tax cuts. Recession with a lack of demand? Tax cuts.

It will not solve this problem. The Democratic proposal, which will not be allowed a fair vote tonight as a true alternative, would put people back to work, would stimulate demand and would, in the interim, help people with unemployment and health care benefits.

The Republicans say it is about jobs. But if you read the bill, you have got to wonder whose jobs where. Because billions of dollars, billions, would flow overseas for overseas tax shelters for interest income overseas. Whose jobs will that support here? No worker that I know in the United States will benefit from those loopholes. But they will pay for it out of their Social Security because that is what finances these tax cuts.

\$250 billion, that is what this bill costs. And it is not going to be paid for by Santa Claus. It will be paid for by that huge sucking sound, one massive withdrawal of the working people's retirement, Social Security trust fund shifted all at once to the wealthiest and largest corporations in this country.

Silk stockings stuffed with cash for the patrons of the party on that side of the aisle. And for the working people of America, not even a lump of coal in their worn stocking because they will cut the LIHEAP program too. There will not even be energy assistance.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I just need to put on the record, I have heard some of my Demo-

cratic colleagues run around with a figure of \$250 billion. I just want to make clear that as we see this cost now, it is far less than under \$150 billion.

Also, as I listened to my colleagues who preceded me, the export jobs depend on this type of legislation. Many U.S. manufacturers have financing arms to fund overseas sales of its products as do other companies. Caterpillar, for example, has 16,500 export-related jobs to suppliers that employ another 33,000.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes and 30 seconds to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KLECZKA).

Mr. KLECZKA. Mr. Speaker, if I were a Republican, I would not want to get up and talk on this rule either. It seems only the Committee on Rules representatives, the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has the guts to do that.

But do we know what is void in this debate today? And I cannot recall in a previous hour and I cannot recall the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) saying it in this rule debate, that the House has already passed a stimulus bill. We passed one 2 weeks ago. But it seems no one wants to talk about that because that is the bill that gave \$1.4 billion to IBM, \$1 billion to Ford, \$850 million to GM. That is what was in that give-away.

So why do not we have a compromise here today? Because the Senate looked at that and said not over their lives. That was dead on arrival. All right.

So there has been talks going on over the last couple weeks. And I know why I am a Democrat and now I know what the Republicans are all about. Do you know why we do not have a compromise with us today? Even though the other body was going to swallow some of the tax cuts, the main reason is the Republicans did not want to do anything of any meaningful value to the unemployed in this country, and to those losing health care.

My colleagues smile. The bill says \$9 billion for health care for unemployment. That goes to the States. There is no guarantee they are going to extend unemployment 13 weeks. They can use those dollars in this bill to cover their current costs, and as far as the health care provision, we use two existing programs to provide meaningful health care coverage to those losing that coverage, but the Republicans are on a different program, and this is what really killed any compromise.

Their long-term goal is to destroy the employer-based health care system in the country. When we get to the bill, I will bring out some charts that will prove that to be their agenda. That is why the Senate said no compromise.

What their bill does is start us on the path of insurance credits. We are going to give them an insurance credit, and

we go through the private market and find a policy, a poor family with no insurance and small income cannot afford a credit, be it 60 percent or whatever, so they are still going to go without.

That is what this debate is all about. It is not stimulus. We passed a \$1.35 trillion bill in June. There is more tax cuts in the pipeline than brains in this House. This is all about doing damage to the health care system of the country.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Just as we fortified our Nation's military in response to the attack of the response of our shores, we have the opportunity tonight to fortify this Nation's economy against the attack on it, keeping jobs by creating jobs and giving needed help to displaced workers.

Make no mistake about it, this economic stimulus is critical to workers and worker families in America. President Bush warned us this past weekend that without an economic stimulus package, we stand to lose as many as 300,000 American jobs. The Republicans mean to me and the agenda we put forth on this Thomas bill as it is debated over the next couple of hours is creating jobs and protecting workers.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. STENHOLM).

Mr. STENHOLM. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule. I rise in even stronger opposition to the basic bill.

I want to commend my colleagues on the other side of the aisle who voted against the previous Martial law, making it true bipartisan opposition. There is an old Blue Dog adage that says, "Select carefully your words today for tomorrow you may eat them."

Mr. Speaker, when the House debated the Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act, the bill enacting the \$1.35 trillion tax cut, I came to this well to warn that this budget bets the ranch that the surpluses that everybody talks about are going to be there. If they are not, we are going to have a difficult time governing in this body in a bipartisan way.

In response to those who dismissed my warnings, I said, I hope I am wrong, as I hope I am wrong tonight, and if I am wrong, I hope I will be able to eat the crow you dish out to me a year from now if I am wrong, but if I am right, get your knives and forks out.

Well, Mr. Speaker, I am going to be eating turkey on Christmas day, and for the sake of my colleagues who argued that we could afford to enact the tax cut and still do everything else they promised, I hope they find some crow that tastes like turkey.

We were told the President's tax cut would provide stimulus to prevent this

country from going into recession. Today, we are being told the \$1.35 trillion was not enough; we need another \$150 billion in tax cuts plus another \$120 billion in spending.

To those who stand up tonight and say if we do not pass this bill we will fail to do anything to stimulate the economy, I have to ask was not that what the tax cut was supposed to do we passed this spring?

When Congress first began discussing options for providing economic stimulus, the bipartisan leader of the Committee on the Budget in this body, the gentleman from Iowa (Mr. NUSSLE) and the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT) agreed on a couple of basic principles for a responsible, effective stimulus package; that the package be temporary in nature, focused on economic stimulus and paid for over the long term so we did not worsen the long-term fiscal situation.

The legislation before us tonight completely ignores these common sense principles and they know it. The Blue Dogs made a simple proposition to the leaders of this House, take what our leaders of the Committee on the Budget recommended that we do, make it temporary, pay for it. The leadership said thanks but no thanks, we do not want any part of that.

Okay. We understand. I understand, I am in the minority, you win. You have won on issue after issue after issue. You are going to win again tonight, but I remind my colleagues again, next February and March when you must come to this floor and ask that the debt ceiling be increased to \$6.7 trillion, I hope the enthusiasm will be there to borrow that money, borrow it on the future of our grandchildren because that is what you are doing.

Why they refuse to pay for this particular package tonight defies my understanding. It would be so simple, so simple, Mr. Speaker, I see Mr. Speaker in the House audience tonight, so simple if we just agreed to pay for it, paygo. What happened to the fiscally responsible proposition of paygo?

Mr. Speaker, when the House debated the "Economic Growth and Tax Relief Reconciliation Act", the bill implementing the \$1.35 trillion tax cut, I came to the House floor to warn "this budget bets the ranch that surpluses that everybody talks about are going to be there. If they are not, we are going to have a difficult time governing in this body in a bipartisan way."

In response to those who dismissed my warnings, I said "I hope I am wrong. I hope I will be able to eat the crow you will dish out to me in a year from now, if I am wrong. But if I am right, get your knives and forks out."

Well, Mr. Speaker, I will be eating turkey on Christmas day. For the sake of my colleagues who argued that we could afford to enact the tax cut and still do everything else you promised, I hope you can find some crow that tastes like turkey.

And we were told that the President's tax cut would provide stimulus to prevent this

country from going into a recession. Today we are being told that the \$1.35 trillion tax cut the President signed into law wasn't enough to stimulate the economy.

Now the same folks who told us that everything would be wonderful if we enacted the President's tax cut proposal are telling us that we can solve all of our problems if we just enact another \$150 billion in tax cuts.

To those who stand up and say that if we don't pass this bill, we will have failed to do anything to stimulate the economy, I have to ask: Wasn't that what the tax cut we passed this spring was supposed to do.

When Congress first began discussing options for providing economic stimulus, the bipartisan leaders of the Budget Committees agreed on a couple of basic principles for a responsible, effective stimulus package—that the package be temporary in nature, focused on economic stimulus, and paid for over the long term so that we did not worsen the long-term fiscal situation. The legislation before us today completely ignores these common sense principles.

The Blue Dogs made the simple suggestion that the costs of providing economic stimulus in the short term be offset by postponing some of the tax cuts for upper income individuals that are scheduled to take effect several years into the future. That would allow us to provide stimulus in the short term without digging us deeper into debt and undermining the fiscal discipline that is essential to the long-term health of our economy. But the majority told us that they would not even consider this common-sense proposal.

The proposal before us is purported to be a centrist deal because it combines the tax cuts advocated by Republicans with much of the spending proposed by Democrats. While that may be described by some as bipartisanship and centrist policies, it does not represent responsible legislating.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

What I do know is that if this legislation is passed tonight, it is not going to be that TOM REYNOLDS wins. The American people and those displaced workers are going to win because we are going to get them some help immediately if we can get the other body to take some action before we break now.

I want to tell my colleagues this, whether you are a Blue Dog or you are a liberal or a Republican or a Democrat, you vote on the motion to recommit, which is a Democratic plan, you voted for tax increases, make no mistake about it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SPRATT), the ranking member on the Committee on the Budget.

Mr. SPRATT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the country is in revision, businesses are failing, people are hurting, losing their jobs by the thousands, and what do we have as a solu-

tion? Here in the middle of the night, hours before we adjourn, we are presented with a bill that half of us have never seen, and what we have seen of it we do not like.

This is called an economic stimulus bill, but it could easily be called round two of tax reduction because it is full of tax cuts that will have a doubtful impact on the economy as a whole, but will have a clear impact on the budget. It will bring the surplus down by \$272 billion. That is the latest estimate just given to us by the Joint Committee on Taxation.

It did not have to be this way, Mr. Speaker. Two months ago, the principals on the Committee on the Budget, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means met to settle on policies to stimulate this economy. We settled instead for a statement of principles. We agreed that stimulus was needed but we thought that it should be temporary, short-lived to last through the recession but no longer. Why? We wanted to keep a cyclical downswing from becoming a structural deficit. We wanted the budget to recover as the economy recovered.

The stimulus bill that was first reported by the Committee on Ways and Means forsook all of these principles. It proposed more permanent tax cuts, lasting a long time after the recession ends.

□ 2345

Here are the stimulus principles that we proposed. Bipartisan, bicameral principles. We said, look, if there is any lesson to be learned from the last 10 years, it is that long-term fiscal discipline is essential to sustain economic growth. We saw it for 8 straight years. The bottom line of the budget got better, and we had 120 consecutive months of economic growth. We said we wanted to continue that policy.

Secondly, we said, have a stimulus policy, surely, but make them last no longer than 1 year.

Thirdly, we said make them broad based, not industry specific. Reading this bill we see plenty of industry specific stuff in it.

Fourthly, we said 1 percent of GDP should do the job, about \$100 billion, and take into consideration, we said, that we have spent \$40 billion since August.

Finally, we said to uphold the policy of repaying the greatest amount of national debt feasible between 2002 and 2011, out-year offsets should make up over time for the cost of near-term economic stimulus. Obviously, we do not want to offset the cost of this bill in this bill today, but we can build into this bill a provision that will regenerate the revenues we will lose from it in the future, and we can absolve the bottom line.

Now, why does all this matter? Why does all this matter? Because a lot of

us who have been here for a long time have this sinking feeling we are about to slip back into the old practice of borrow and spend. Why does it matter? Because of the lesson we have learned for the past 10 years.

This year we started with the best fiscal condition the country has ever enjoyed, a surplus projected to be \$5.6 trillion just last January. Today, that surplus stands at \$2.6 trillion and is falling fast. The economy is taking its toll, but 55 percent of the decline in the surplus was due to the tax cuts we passed last June.

Now, this \$2.6 trillion, \$2.3 trillion range in which the surplus now lies is all together Social Security and Medicare surplus. There is no general fund surplus at all. And this is before farm bill, before defense supplemental, before homeland security, and before assessing the \$272 billion cost of this bill. Why are we worried about this bill? Because it is going to wipe out the surplus. It will dash our hopes which we held together of taking the Social Security surplus, saving the surplus, and buying off the national debt so that we prepare ourselves for the retirement of the baby boomers.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, has doubtful effects on the economy, but it has a clear impact on the budget, and it is a deleterious impact. It is something we do not need to do. There is another way of doing it. There is a principled way of doing it. We should take that path and not take the path this bill proposes.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I inquire of the time remaining on both sides.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The gentleman from Texas (Mr. FROST) has 9½ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from New York (Mr. REYNOLDS) has 16 minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. WOOLSEY).

Ms. WOOLSEY. Mr. Speaker, I view this stimulus package through the eyes of a welfare mother. I can do that, because 30 years ago I was a welfare mom. And even though I was working, I needed aid for dependent children to get the health care and the child care and the food stamps I needed for my three young children.

When Congress passed the welfare reform bill, I warned that getting women off the welfare rolls and into work would not be good enough if and when we had a downturn in our economy. Well, the downturn is here; and these women are hit with a triple whammy: no job, no health care, no unemployment insurance.

Our top priority in stimulating this economy must be putting money in the hands of people who need it and will use it. Those are our American families. The only acceptable economic

stimulus package is one that takes care of the Nation's families, not our billionaires. We must stimulate the economy by providing for our children, giving money to families, and providing workers unemployment insurance and health coverage.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BENTSEN).

Mr. BENTSEN. Mr. Speaker, once again our Republican colleagues have decided to choose politics over policy. And tonight, as we head into the next morning, we are going to pass a bill that will never pass the other body. And, quite frankly, if it were to pass, I do not think it would have much effect on the general economy.

In fact, we were asked to pass a \$1.3 trillion tax bill earlier this year that was supposed to stimulate the economy at that point in time, when it was apparent that we were heading into a recession, and all we saw that happened was that the recession got deeper and the deficit appeared and the surplus went away.

Our colleague from New York says this bill is only going to cost \$150 billion, not \$270 billion. But, of course, he is forgetting about the fact we are going to have to borrow another \$115 billion of debt when we should have been paying down the national debt.

Now, if we really wanted to have a stimulus bill that would have some economic effect, and I am glad to see our Republican friends have all become Keynesians, I thought they were monitorists, but now they are Keynesians this week, what we would do is extend the unemployment benefits for 26 weeks, because we know we are going to have a longer recession than what was projected; and we would do the COBRA extension, like has been discussed. And if the Republicans are really serious about trying to transform health care and they care about the 45 percent who are not in COBRA, well maybe we could do that also. But they do not care about the 55 percent who are in COBRA.

And they want to come up with a plan that the Treasury Department, which is now apparently taking over health care in this country, has not even developed yet. Maybe sometime this spring we will have a program. Maybe if someone has been unemployed for 26 weeks, and as my colleague from Texas says, they are able to scrape together enough to pay the full premium, at the end of the year, in April of 2003, they will get a tax credit back. It is not going to work.

So if we want to do something to help the people that are unemployed, and I want to, and I think all of us do, let us pass a basic bill that extends unemployment, that extends COBRA, and helps the people who have been hurt by this recession.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. KUCINICH).

Mr. KUCINICH. Mr. Speaker, this bill could have been a lifeline for working families suffering as a result of the economic decline. This bill could have increased weekly payments to unemployed individuals and extended benefits to 52 weeks. This bill could have subsidized COBRA health insurance for those left uninsured as a result of lay-off. This bill could have boosted its spending on critical security and infrastructure programs in order to jumpstart the economy. This bill could have been a stimulus package. Instead, it is an expensive giveaway to those who need it least: a payback to Fortune 500 companies, who will guarantee further jobs will be cut.

Our plan supplemented weekly benefits by no less than \$65. Our plan guaranteed a full year of benefits to any individual eligible for unemployment benefits under State law. Our plan expanded eligibility to include part-time and other low-wage workers. This is critical, as currently less than 40 percent of unemployed Americans receive benefits.

Dickens' "Christmas Carol" had Scrooge lighten up, give Cratchet a raise, and bring his son Tiny Tim some cheer. This bill before us would have Scrooge firing Cratchet, canceling his pension, and beating Tiny Tim with his own crutch.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. MATHESON).

Mr. MATHESON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my opposition to this bill.

This bill fails to meet all the criteria we ought to be looking for to provide an appropriate economic stimulus. It should have a rapid and temporary impact, it should increase employment and investment, it should provide adequate assistance for those who are vulnerable to an economic downturn, and it should be paid for in the long term to prevent future deficits.

When I was elected to Congress, I made a promise to my constituents to be an independent voice and to make fiscally responsible decisions. Just as Utah families have to make responsible decisions to maintain their households and keep their finances in order, so must the Federal Government.

Early this year, I did support the tax cut. This bill had a number of important provisions for Utah families, and it was enacted at a time when we did have unprecedented government surpluses. But today we are facing deficits, increased debt, and we are fighting a war. Winning the war on terrorism and taking care of our homeland defense will require significant resources. Ensuring we have adequate resources to fund these priorities is a

smart investment, as it will have the long-term benefit of ensuring safety and protection of American lives, homes and businesses.

We should reject this bill and work to come up with a targeted, temporary stimulus proposal that is paid for in the long term so we do not increase our national debt.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SANCHEZ).

Ms. SANCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, when Congress gave billions of dollars to corporate titans after the events of September 11 and the slowdown in the economy, we promised that we would take care of the workers. Unfortunately, Congress has not kept its promise.

During the last 2 months, over 1 million Americans have been added to the unemployment rolls. But this bill provides only modest benefits, maybe, to them. Many of the people I represent are employed in jobs directly related to the tourism industry. These are the jobs that have been hit the hardest, and these are the workers that need the most help. I read yesterday in my local newspaper that analysts are predicting that Disneyland, the largest employer in my district, may not rebound for many years to come.

This bill is not what small businesses want or unemployed workers need. They need temporary business and individual cuts targeted at really stimulating this economy. This is about small businesses closing their doors and people being laid off. This is about people saying I cannot afford rent and health care and food.

We provided relief for the airlines; we provided relief for the insurance agencies. Let us do this. Let us do it the right way.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would ask how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 3½ minutes remaining.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. TURNER).

Mr. TURNER. Mr. Speaker, time after time, the Members of this House have pledged by votes cast on this floor to protect Social Security. We know that until just a few months ago we were projecting surpluses as far as the eye could see. And we pledged, when we passed the June tax cut, to protect Social Security. Then came the recession, then came the war, and the projected surpluses have turned into projected deficits for years into the future.

Times have changed, but our principles should not change. Is it right to

pledge the lockbox for Social Security one day and to abandon it the next? What does the abandonment of that pledge say to our senior citizens and to our children who will be left with a bankrupt Social Security trust fund?

Both sides of this aisle agree we need to have a stimulus package to help the jobless workers with unemployment and health insurance. Both sides agree that we must stimulate business investments.

□ 2400

But it is only the Democratic proposal that protects Social Security, only the Democratic proposal refuses to increase the national debt. In contrast, the Republican proposal increases the national debt by \$250 billion. The Democratic proposal is paid for, not by increasing taxes on any individual or business, but by adjusting the effective tax rates for future yet to be realized and implemented tax cuts.

Under the Democratic proposal, the total tax cuts passed by this Congress last June will remain exactly the same. If the gentleman from New York calls the Democratic bill a tax cut, the gentleman has a different calculator than I do. Fiscal responsibility demands that not only must we protect and preserve the current economic situation and protect against the slowdown, but we must protect the economy of the future. Recommit this bill, and let us pay for it.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, first of all, the Republican Party in this Congress extended the life of Social Security; and the same leadership will ensure that we preserve and strengthen it. I share with my colleague who is under some fallacy that there is not a tax increase on the Democratic plan. On page 2 at the bottom, a revenue offset freezing the top rate 38.6.

Mr. Speaker, we passed law of the land that changed that tax rate. If we are going to restore higher taxes, it is a vote to increase taxes. Make no mistake about it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield 45 seconds to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. INSLEE).

Mr. INSLEE. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the season, I must admit that under the Republican controlled House, it is indeed a wonderful life. Because when the Republicans control the House, whenever the voting bell rings, a corporate tax lobbyist gets his wings. Merry Christmas, Enron. Merry Christmas, General Electric. To my friends across the aisle and their corporate tax lobbyist friends, God bless everyone, because when the American people find out that Social Security was raided to take care of Republican friends, the American people will not.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we are going to bring out that same old thing and beat that dog on Social Security. As I said earlier, the Republicans extended it, and they are going to take care of it. I also remind my colleagues on the lock box and both the speakers who spoke before me, there were three conditions set on the lock box that we said would cause us to have to look at the lock box. One was war; two was the economy; and three was natural disaster. We have seen natural disaster, we have seen our economy, and we have seen war as conditions, as we have faced those tough decisions together on a bipartisan basis starting the day of September 11 when this Congress came together in a bipartisan fashion.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I would ask if the gentleman from New York has any other speakers.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, after the gentleman from Texas closes, I will close.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, it is very clear what the situation is. The Republicans made a conscious decision to break off bipartisan discussions and to bring back to the floor a bill tonight that they know cannot pass and will not even be taken up in the Senate. This was an extraordinary mistake on the part of the Republican majority. They were playing chicken with the United States Senate. This is a childish game. The American Republican will be the losers.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, there are new incentives to compete and grow and expand the bipartisan, bicameral Economic Security and Worker Protection Act. The Act will help businesses rebuild and create jobs for the American people.

So far all I have heard from the other side is a lot of rhetoric about what they would like to do, but we cannot get them to sit down and negotiate out a compromise. So what do we have? We have the chairman of the Committee on Ways and Means move from where his past position was over to adding more unemployment insurance money, adding more incentives to try to lure a bipartisan compromise that could be completed. The reality is he has moved as far as he can until the other body determines that they will negotiate.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line is that the workers deserve a paycheck, not an unemployment check. Of course this stimulus package recognizes that job creation is a long-term project, and assisting those out of work requires immediate short-term solutions. For those who have lost their jobs, an additional 13 weeks of unemployment benefits will be provided retroactive to

March 2001. Part-time workers will be aided with \$9 billion in surplus Federal unemployment funds transferred to States in order to help with health care or employment services.

Equally important to our workforce is the availability and affordability of adequate health care. With the refundable health care tax credits provided by this legislation, no worker eligible for unemployment insurance will be left without the means to obtain quality health care protection.

Some of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and in the other Chamber wanted only COBRA-eligible workers to get a tax credit, leaving out 45 percent of laid off workers in small and medium-sized businesses, and those who never had job-based health care at all.

And let us not forget, not for one minute, who some of these workers are. What about those who owned or worked in the delis and the dry cleaners or delivered goods and cleaned offices in lower Manhattan, should they have been excluded from being able to afford health care, as many would under the plan advanced by the Democratic leadership in the other body?

The bipartisan compromise plan, on the other hand, provides a refundable 60 percent tax credit for health insurance premium paid by displaced workers. Those workers who had prior health care insurance coverage will have the right to guaranteed coverage. Additionally, the bill provides for an extension of the Archer Medical Savings Accounts allowing families and individuals to be in charge of their own health care dollars.

Mr. Speaker, our action tonight sends a strong message that this House is working to retain jobs, create jobs, and to protect displaced workers in their time of need. Colleagues, let us finish this year as it began, in a strong bipartisan effort that will protect American workers and create American jobs. I strongly urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LATOURETTE). The Chair would remind Members it is not appropriate under the rules to characterize either the action or inaction of the other body.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the resolution.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Evidently a quorum is not present.

The Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 198, not voting 18, as follows:

[Roll No. 507]

YEAS—219

Aderholt	Goss	Pence
Akin	Graham	Peterson (PA)
Armey	Granger	Petri
Bachus	Graves	Pickering
Ballenger	Green (WI)	Pitts
Barr	Greenwood	Platts
Bartlett	Grucci	Pombo
Barton	Gutknecht	Portman
Bass	Hall (TX)	Pryce (OH)
Bereuter	Hansen	Putnam
Biggert	Hart	Quinn
Bilirakis	Hastert	Radanovich
Blunt	Hastings (WA)	Ramstad
Boehler	Hayes	Regula
Boehner	Hayworth	Rehberg
Bonilla	Herger	Reynolds
Bono	Hilleary	Riley
Boozman	Hobson	Rogers (KY)
Brady (TX)	Hoekstra	Rogers (MI)
Brown (SC)	Horn	Rohrabacher
Bryant	Hostettler	Ros-Lehtinen
Burr	Houghton	Roukema
Burton	Hulshof	Royce
Buyer	Hunter	Ryan (WI)
Callahan	Hyde	Ryun (KS)
Calvert	Isakson	Saxton
Camp	Issa	Schaffer
Cannon	Istook	Schrock
Cantor	Jenkins	Sensenbrenner
Capito	Johnson (CT)	Sessions
Castle	Johnson (IL)	Shadegg
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Shaw
Chambliss	Keller	Shays
Coble	Kelly	Sherwood
Collins	Kennedy (MN)	Shimkus
Combest	Kerns	Shuster
Cooksey	King (NY)	Simmons
Cox	Kingston	Simpson
Crane	Kirk	Skeen
Crenshaw	Knollenberg	Smith (MI)
Culberson	Kolbe	Smith (NJ)
Cunningham	LaHood	Smith (TX)
Davis, Jo Ann	Largent	Souder
Davis, Tom	Latham	Stump
Deal	LaTourette	Sununu
DeLay	Leach	Sweeney
DeMint	Lewis (CA)	Tancred
Diaz-Balart	Lewis (KY)	Tauzin
Doolittle	Linder	Taylor (NC)
Dreier	LoBiondo	Terry
Duncan	Lucas (KY)	Thomas
Dunn	Lucas (OK)	Thornberry
Ehlers	Manzullo	Thune
Ehrlich	McCrery	Tiahrt
Emerson	McHugh	Tiberi
English	McInnis	Toomey
Everett	McKeon	Traficant
Ferguson	Mica	Upton
Flake	Miller, Dan	Vitter
Fletcher	Miller, Gary	Walden
Foley	Miller, Jeff	Walsh
Forbes	Moran (KS)	Wamp
Fossella	Morella	Watkins (OK)
Frelinghuysen	Myrick	Watts (OK)
Galleghy	Nethercutt	Weldon (FL)
Ganske	Ney	Weldon (PA)
Gekas	Northup	Weller
Gibbons	Norwood	Whitfield
Gilchrest	Nussle	Wicker
Gillmor	Osborne	Wilson (NM)
Gilman	Ose	Wilson (SC)
Goode	Otter	Wolf
Goodlatte	Paul	Young (FL)

NAYS—198

Abercrombie	Barcia	Blagojevich
Ackerman	Barrett	Blumenauer
Allen	Becerra	Bonior
Andrews	Bentsen	Borski
Baca	Berkley	Boswell
Baird	Berman	Boucher
Baldacci	Berry	Boyd
Baldwin	Bishop	Brady (PA)

Brown (FL)	Jackson-Lee	Pascarell
Brown (OH)	(TX)	Pastor
Capps	Jefferson	Payne
Capuano	John	Pelosi
Cardin	Johnson, E. B.	Peterson (MN)
Carson (IN)	Jones (OH)	Phelps
Carson (OK)	Kanjorski	Pomeroy
Clay	Kaptur	Price (NC)
Clayton	Kildee	Rahall
Clyburn	Kilpatrick	Rangel
Condit	Kind (WI)	Reyes
Conyers	Klecza	Rivers
Costello	Kucinich	Rodriguez
Coyne	LaFalce	Roemer
Cramer	Lampson	Ross
Crowley	Langevin	Rothman
Cummings	Lantos	Roybal-Allard
Davis (CA)	Larsen (WA)	Rush
Davis (FL)	Larson (CT)	Sabo
Davis (IL)	Lee	Sanchez
DeFazio	Levin	Sanders
DeGette	Lewis (GA)	Sandlin
Delahunt	Lipinski	Sawyer
DeLauro	Lofgren	Schakowsky
Deutsch	Lowey	Schiff
Dicks	Lynch	Scott
Dingell	Maloney (CT)	Serrano
Doggett	Maloney (NY)	Sherman
Dooley	Markey	Shows
Doyle	Mascara	Skelton
Edwards	Matheson	Slaughter
Engel	Matsui	Smith (WA)
Eshoo	McCarthy (MO)	Snyder
Etheridge	McCarthy (NY)	Solis
Evans	McCollum	Spratt
Farr	McDermott	Stenholm
Fattah	McGovern	Strickland
Filner	McIntyre	Stupak
Ford	McKinney	Tanner
Frank	McNulty	Tauscher
Frank	Meehan	Taylor (MS)
Frost	Meeks (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Gonzalez	Menendez	Thompson (MS)
Green (TX)	Millender-	Thurman
Gutierrez	McDonald	Tierney
Harman	Miller, George	Towns
Hill	Mink	Turner
Hilliard	Mollohan	Udall (CO)
Hinches	Moore	Udall (NM)
Hinojosa	Moran (VA)	Velázquez
Hoefel	Murtha	Visclosky
Holden	Nadler	Waters
Holt	Napolitano	Watson (CA)
Honda	Neal	Watt (NC)
Hooley	Oberstar	Waxman
Hoyer	Obey	Weiner
Inslee	Olver	Woolsey
Israel	Ortiz	Wu
Jackson (IL)	Pallone	Wynn

NOT VOTING—18

Baker	Hastings (FL)	Owens
Clement	Hefley	Oxley
Cubin	Jones (NC)	Stark
Gephardt	Kennedy (RI)	Stearns
Gordon	Luther	Wexler
Hall (OH)	Meek (FL)	Young (AK)

□ 0034

Mrs. CAPPS, Mr. RUSH and Ms. JACKSON-LEE of Texas changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

So the resolution was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### CANCELLATION OF PRAYER BREAKFAST ON THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2001

(Mr. STUPAK asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. STUPAK. Mr. Speaker, if I may, as President of the Prayer Group, we will not have the prayer breakfast tomorrow at 8 o'clock because of the